

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/815,130	03/22/2001	Kuo-Jeng Wang	JCLA6533	4302
	7590 11/29/2004	1	EXAMINER	
J.C. Patents, Inc.			HUYNH, KIM NGOC	
4 Venture, Suite 250 Irvine, CA 92618			ART UNIT PAPER NU	
,			2182	
			DATE MAILED: 11/29/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Occurred	09/815,130	WANG, KUO-JENG				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kim Huynh	2182				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	66(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	ely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 M	arch 2001.					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2 and 10-13</u> is/are rejected.						
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>3-9</u> is/are objected to.	•					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers		•				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) objected to by the I	Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	•					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	ed in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau	` '''					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the centhed copies not receive	sa.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate atent Application (PTO-152)				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	atent Application (FTO+132)				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-2 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over DeWilde et al. (US 6,434,674).

Claim 1, DeWilde discloses a transmission configuration for processing batches of data comprising a synchronous dynamic memory (SDRAM 10) for holding data, wherein the synchronous dynamic memory also has a masking function for processing a portion of the data (col. 4, II. 33-38 and col. 5, II. 58-61, masking lines 14-16); and a first buffer unit 26 coupled to the synchronous dynamic memory serving as a temporary storage area of data sent from the synchronous dynamic memory.

As for the recitation of using the transmission configuration in a scanner, please note it is an intended use. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to utilize the device of DeWilde to transmit data in various applications/devices (including scanners) in order to provide cost effective method with numerous advantages including increase efficiency of memory use and obtainable memory throughput for high speed and direct data flow (col. 2, II. 1-3 and col. 4, II. 4-38).

Page 3

Art Unit: 2182

Please note an intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Claim 2, DeWilde discloses the masking function is capable of blanking unwanted data when the useful data is less than the quantity of data is less than the quantity of data a burst mode can transmit (col. 2, II. 4-3, col. 5, II. 1-5 and col. 7, II. 17-35).

Claim 10, DeWilde discloses a method (col. 7, II. 5-39) for transmit data to a SDRAM 10 having steps of: a) determining if the quantity of data (PCI burst data) written into the SDRAM 10 is greater than or equal to the transmission quantity of a burst mode transmission (full burst) (if PCI words equal to 8 words, col. 7, II. 10-15), (b) executing a write command so that the data is written into the SDRAM if the quantity of data is greater than or equal to the transmission quantity (modify the content of the SDRAM with words having mask bit set at 0); (c) determining if the data is the last remaining data if the quantity of data is smaller than the transmission quantity (if the PCI burst ends before the last of the two wide words, col. 7, II. 32-35); (d) executing a write command so that the last remaining data is written into the SDRAM if the data is the last remaining data (col. 7, II. 35-37); and (e) returning to step (a) if the data is not the last

Application/Control Number: 09/815,130

Art Unit: 2182

remaining data until all the data is written into the SDRAM (if the transferred word is not the second of the wide word, return to step 102). As for the recitation of scanner, please see the discussion of claim 1.

Claim 11, DeWilde discloses comparing the PCI bus words against the burst mode (col. 7, II. 1-15) and checking to see if the end of the PCI data ends before the last word of the burst mode (col. 7, II. 28-30). End of packet flag is required for data transmission protocol and would be included in the PCI data of DeWilde. Since DeWilde disclose comparing the PCI data and the end of the PCI data against the burst mode. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to realized that the end of packet tag is used in order to determine the end of the PCI data packet.

Claim 12, DeWilde discloses a method for reading out data from a SDRAM 10 (see col. 8, II. 1-23) comprising the steps of: (a) determining if the quantity of data in the SDRAM is greater than or equal to the transmission quantity of a burst mode transmission (col. 7, II. 46-53), (b) executing a read command so that the data is read from the SDRAM and written into a buffer unit if the quantity of scan data is greater than or equal to the transmission quantity; (c) determining if the data is the last remaining scan data if the quantity of data is smaller than the transmission quantity (d) executing a read command so that the last remaining data is written into the buffer unit 26 if the data is the last remaining data; and (e) determining if the quantity of data stored in the SDRAM 10 is greater than or equal to the transmission quantity of a burst mode transmission if the data is not the last remaining data, continuing until all the data are

read from the SDRAM and written into the buffer unit (col. 8, II. 1-14). As for the recitation of scanner, please see the discussion of claim 1.

Claim 13, DeWilde discloses the blanking function is used to blank out redundant data when the quantity of data is less than the transmission quantity of the burst mode transmission (masking/blanking during read operation, col. 7, II. 39-44).

Allowable Subject Matter

- 3. Claims 3-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 4. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter

Claim 3 recites, inter alia, the transmission configuration for processing batch data using SDRAM with a masking function and includes the buffers, buffer controller, and the counter and comparator for counting/comparing the preset data transmission quantities as claimed.

The references of record do not teach or suggest the aforementioned limitation, nor would it be obvious to modify those references to include such limitation.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

DeWidle et al. (US 6,434,674) is a continuation of DeWilde et al. (US 6,571,302) which provides a better illustration of the READ and WRITE operation of the SDRAM is provided for applicant's consideration.

Good et al. (US 6,240,095) illustrated in Fig. 4 a flag 58 to signifies the end of data packet. Andrewartha et al. (US 5,974,514) and Hughes (US 5,784,582) disclose various devices for burst transmission.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kim Huynh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4147.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kim Huynh

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2182

KH 11/20/04